Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:** 

The attached replacement sheet of drawings, including Figure 1, replaces the previously

submitted sheet of drawings including Figure 1. More specifically, Applicants have amended

Figure 1. The replacement sheet has been clearly labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page

header.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet of drawings including Figure 1

Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

**REMARKS** 

Claims 1-14 remain in the application. Claims 1-14 have been amended. Claim 1 is in

independent form.

**Drawings** 

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to

show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In response, Applicant has attached

1 replacement sheet of drawings hereto directly following these Remarks. The replacement sheet

has been labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header as per 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d).

In amended Figure 1, the axis D of pin 56 has been added as suggested by the

Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be

withdrawn.

**Specification** 

2a. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the note concerning

patent US-5855130 at page 3. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by deleting

the reference to patent US-5855130 at page 3 as suggested by the Examiner.

2b. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "as

defined in claim 1" at page 4, lines 6 and 7. In response, Applicant has amended the

specification by deleting "as defined in claim 1" as suggested by the Examiner.

2c. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "pawl

or pawl 16" at page 8, line 10. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

replacing "pawl or pawl 16" with "pawl 16" as suggested by the Examiner.

Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

2d. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "pawl

21" at page 9, line 18. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by replacing "pawl

21" with "pawl 16" as suggested by the Examiner.

2e. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "pin

46" at page 15, line 9 and at page 16, line 9. In response, Applicant has amended the

specification by replacing both instances of "pin 46" with "pin 56" as suggested by the

Examiner.

2f. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"transmission lever 46" at page 15, line 10. In response, Applicant has amended the

specification by replacing "transmission lever 46" with "transmission lever 57" as suggested by

the Examiner.

2g. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"Figures 1, 2, and 7" at page 18, line 17. In response, Applicant has amended the specification

by replacing "Figures 1, 2, and 7" with "Figures 1, 2, 7 and 9" as suggested by the Examiner.

2h. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "an

electric motor 90" at page 20, line 18. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

replacing "an electric motor 90" with "an electric motor 89, 90" as suggested by the Examiner.

2i. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"prismatic intermediate portion 105, 106" at page 22, line 9. In response, Applicant has

amended the specification by replacing "prismatic intermediate portion 105, 106" with

"prismatic intermediate portion 106, 107" as suggested by the Examiner.

2j. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "end

portion 11a" at page 24, line 4. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

replacing "end portion 11a" with "end portion 110" as suggested by the Examiner.

2k. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of the

word "of" before the phrase "the shafts 71, 72" and the word "of" before the phrase "the key

Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

cylinder 82" at page 29, line 23. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

deleting both instances of the word "of" as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant has also amended the specification by ending the sentence after the

phrase "the key cylinder 82" and beginning the next sentence with "An electrical circuit 147" as

suggested by the Examiner.

Finally, in the new sentence beginning with "An electrical circuit 147" Applicant

has deleted the word "which" in line 5 as suggested by the Examiner.

21. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of "a

corresponding housing and from which there project electrical-connection means 150" at page

30, line 13. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by replacing "a corresponding

housing and from which there project electrical-connection means 150" with "a corresponding

housing and from which there projects an electrical-connection means 150" as suggested by the

Examiner.

2m. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"counterclockwise" at page 32, line 10 and at page 33, line 5. In response, Applicant has

amended the specification by replacing both instances of "counterclockwise" with "clockwise"

as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"clockwise" at page 32, line 15. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

replacing "clockwise" with "counterclockwise" as suggested by the Examiner.

2n. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"clockwise" at page 33, line 21 and at page 33, line 26. Applicant respectfully points out that

clockwise rotation of the internal-control lever 55, not counterclockwise as suggested by the

Examiner, brings about counterclockwise rotation of the transmission lever 57 and the

consequent action of thrust of the projection 68 on the portion 36 of the opening lever 30 causes

counterclockwise rotation of the opening lever 30. In response, Applicant has amended the

Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

specification by replacing only the one instance of "clockwise" at page 33, line 26 with

"counterclockwise" as suggested by the Examiner.

20. The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the recitation of

"Figure 6" at page 33, line 18. In response, Applicant has amended the specification by

replacing "Figure 6" with "Figure 5" as suggested by the Examiner.

The specification has been further amended to clarify terminology set forth in the

application as filed. Applicant attests that no new matter has been added thereto.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification

be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. The Examiner has objected to claims 5-13 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in

improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple

dependent claim. In response, Applicant has amended claims 5-13 to be in dependent form

rather than multiple dependent form.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 5-13 be

withdrawn.

4. The Examiner has objected to claims 1-14 because of the following informalities:

a. The Examiner has objected to claim 1 because of the recitation of

"characterized in that" at line 23. In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 by replacing

"characterized in that" with "wherein" as suggested by the Examiner.

b. The Examiner has objected to claims 2-14 because of the recitation of

"characterized in that" at the first line of each claim. In response, Applicant has amended claims

2-14 by replacing "characterized in that" with "wherein" as suggested by the Examiner.

Amdt dated February 26, 2007

Reply to Office action of December 27, 2006

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-14 because of various grammatical c.

errors. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-14 by appropriate correction of any

grammatical errors as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1-14 be

withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that this patent application is in condition for

allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions

regarding this amendment or the patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee associated

with this Communication to Deposit Account No. 50-1759. A duplicate of this form is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin W. Asher (Reg. No. 41,590)

Clark Hill PLC

500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500

Detroit, MI 48226-3435

(313) 965-8300

Date: 2/27/07

Attorney Docket No: 19339-099974